

REMARKS

Claims 1-10 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 6, and 9 presented in independent form. Applicants have amended claims 1, 6, and 9. Reconsideration and reversal of the rejections are respectfully requested in light of the following.

Objection to the Specification

The Examiner objected to Applicants' specification for failing to provide section headings throughout the specification. Applicants have amended the specification to provide section headings, as detailed above.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

The Examiner rejected claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,899,467 to McDonald et al. (hereinafter "McDonald"). As is stated in MPEP 2131, "[a] claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference" (citing *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987)). Furthermore, *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989), stated that "[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the...claim." Applicants respectfully submit that McDonald does not include each and every limitation of Applicants' claims 1-10 and, therefore, does not anticipate claims 1-10 for at least the reasons provided herein.

McDonald teaches a fiber optic plug 10 having a crimp band 62 connects the fiber optic connector 16 and the fiber optic cable 12 (Col. 9, Lines 56-59). The crimp band 62 extends between a first end 72 and a second end 74 and further includes a key 82, such as a longitudinal rib, carried on an enlarged portion 86.

Independent Claim 1

Applicants respectfully submit that McDonald does not disclose each and every limitation of amended claim 1, which recites a crimp for an optical cable connector, comprising "a hollow crimp body that is open at each end and comprises, at a first end, a first crushable crimp tube for crimping onto a connector; and at a second end a second crushable crimp tube for

crimping onto a cable, the portion of the crimp between the said ends defining a body portion having a dimension greater than that of the crimp tubes and including a recess for engagement by a closure housing, where the recess is positioned intermediate a first surface and a second surface of the body portion and has a dimension less than that of the body portion.”

With respect to Applicants’ claim 1, the Examiner provides a drawing on page 8 of the Office Action and states that enlarged portion 86 of McDonald “is interpreted as a body portion” (Office Action, page 3). Applicants believe that McDonald does not disclose a body portion with a recess that is positioned intermediate a first surface and a second surface of the body portion and has a dimension less than that of the body portion (as shown in Applicants’ FIGS. 2-4). The Examiner’s drawing indicates that the recess extends from key 82 to second portion 65 of crimp band 62. As such, (and without acquiescing in the Examiner’s characterization or usage of the term “recess”) the recess is not intermediate a first surface and a second surface of the body portion 86 but rather, the recess is positioned between second portion 65 of crimp band 62 and key 82. Neither second portion 65 nor key 82 defines a first or a second surface of enlarged portion 86. Therefore, the groove is not intermediate a first surface and a second surface of enlarged portion 86.

Applicants believe that amended independent claim 1 is in condition for allowance because McDonald fails to disclose each and every limitation of claim 1. Claims 2-5 depend from claim 1 and necessarily include each and every limitation recited therein, therefore, Applicants also believe that claims 2-5 are in condition for allowance.

Independent Claim 6

Applicants respectfully submit that McDonald does not disclose each and every limitation of amended claim 6, which recites a crimp comprising “a hollow crimp body that is open at each end and comprises, at a first end, a first crushable crimp tube for crimping onto a connector; and at a second end a second crushable crimp tube for crimping onto a cable, the portion of the crimp between the said ends including a grooved recess that creates a first surface and a second surface extending transverse to a longitudinal direction of the hollow crimp body for engagement by a closure housing, and further comprising an optical cable inserted therethrough, the crimp tube at the said first end of the crimp being crimped onto the spigot of a connector so as to retain thereon the reinforcing fibers of the optical cable; and the crimp tube at

the said second end being crimped onto the exterior of the optical cable, the crimp at the second end provides tensional relief the optical cable at the first end.”

As with claim 1, the Examiner indicates that McDonald’s enlarged portion 86 is interpreted as a body portion (Office Action, page 3). The Examiner further indicates that the grooved recess may be seen in McDonald’s Figs. 2 and 7 and is identified as “the groove to the left of enlarged portion 86, formed by the enlarged portion 86 and second end 74” (Office Action, page 4). Similar to claim 1, the recess extends between enlarged portion 86 and second end 74 of crimp band 62. As such, the recess does not create a first surface and a second surface that extend transversely to a longitudinal direction of the crimp band 62.

Furthermore, McDonald does not provide for tensional relief to the optical cable, as is recited in Applicants’ claim 6. In particular, the second end of the crimp provides tensional relief to the optical cable at the first end of the crimp. Instead, Applicants note that McDonald discloses only torsional restraint, stating that “the fiber optic plug 10 advantageously protects the optical fibers 130 from the deleterious effects of torque imparted to the fiber optic cable” (Col. 12, Lines 25-27) (emphasis added). McDonald fails to disclose that fiber optic plug 10 provides any tensional relief to the fiber optic cable 12 but further emphasizes that “forces generated by torque will, in turn, be transmitted from the crimp band to the plug body via the respective engagement members, such as the key 82 carried by the crimp band and the corresponding passageway 84 defined by the plug body” (Col. 12, Lines 31-36) (emphasis added).

As such, Applicants believe that amended independent claim 6 is in condition for allowance because McDonald fails to disclose a recess creating a first surface and a second surface extending transversely to a longitudinal direction of a crimp body, and further fails to disclose that a second end of a crimp provides tensional relief to an optical cable at a first end of the crimp. Therefore, each and every limitation of Applicants’ claim 6 is not disclosed by McDonald. Dependent claims 7-8 include the limitations recited in claim 6 and also are believed to be in condition for allowance for at least these reasons.

Independent Claim 9

Applicants respectfully submit that McDonald does not disclose each and every limitation of amended claim 9, which recites a method of securing an optical cable to a connector comprising the steps of “(i) inserting an optical cable through a crimp so as to protrude at either

end thereof, the crimp including a body portion extending intermediate a first crimp tube and a second crimp tube, the body portion having a length and a diameter greater than that of at least one of the first and second crimp tubes; (ii) removing the jacket of the optical cable to expose the core and reinforcement fibers thereof; (iii) inserting the core into a connector spigot; (iv) arranging the reinforcing fibers about the spigot; (v) advancing the crimp so that the first crimp tube overlies the spigot and the fibers; (vi) crimping the first crimp tube onto the spigot so as to retain the fibers on the spigot; and, before or after step (vi), (vii) crimping the second crimp tube onto the exterior of the cable.”

As disclosed above, the Examiner indicates that McDonald’s enlarged portion 86 is interpreted as a body portion and first end 72 and second 74 of crimp band 62 may be interpreted as a first crimp tube and a second crimp tube, respectively, as recited in Applicants’ claims. With this understanding, Applicants submit that McDonald does not disclose a body portion having a length and a diameter greater than that of first and second crimp tubes. Rather, enlarged portion 86 has a length shorter than first end 72 and second end 74, as is shown in McDonald’s Figs. 2 and 4.

Therefore, Applicants believe that amended independent claim 9 is in condition for allowance. Likewise, Applicants submit that dependent claim 10 also is in condition for allowance for at least the reasons given with respect to claim 9.

Final Remarks

Applicants believe that all of the pending claims 1-10 are in condition for allowance and respectfully request passage thereof.

In the event Applicants have overlooked the need for an additional extension of time or payment of fee, Applicants hereby petition for and authorize that any charges be made to Deposit Account No. 02-0390, Baker & Daniels LLP.

If any questions concerning this application should arise, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at 317-237-1115.

Respectfully submitted,

/ERIC J. GROEN/

Eric J. Groen
Registration No. 32,230
Attorney for Applicants

BAKER & DANIELS LLP
300 North Meridian Street
Suite 2700
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204
Telephone: 317-237-1115
Facsimile: 317-237-1000

Date Submitted: April 29, 2011